FORM 26. Docketing Statement

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
No. 16-1123
Personal Audio, LLC
<b>v.</b>
Electronic Frontier Foundation
DOCKETING STATEMENT
This Docketing Statement must be completed by all counsel and filed with the court within 14 days of the date of docketing. When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, this Docketing Statement must be completed by all counsel and filed with the court within 30 days of docketing.
Name of the party you represent Personal Audio, LLC
Party is (select one)  Appellant/Petitioner Cross-Appellant  Appellee/Respondent Intervenor
Tribunal appealed from and Case No. Patent Trial and Appeal Board (IPR2014-00070)
Date of Judgment/Order April 10, 2015 Type of Case Inter Partes Review
Relief sought on appeal Reversal of PTAB's Final Written Decision
Relief awarded below (if damages, specify)
Determination of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504
Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from
On April 10, 2015 the PTAB issued a Final Written Decision holding that claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 are unpatentable (Paper 41). On July 17, 2015, the PTAB denied a motion for rehearing on the matter (Paper 45).

Form 26

Case: 16-1123 Document: 9 Page: 2 Filed: 11/09/2015

Form 26

## FORM 26. Docketing Statement (continued)

	✓ Final Judgment, 28 USC 1295				
	☐ Rule 54(b)				
	☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type)				
	Other (explain; see Fed. Cir. R. 28(a)(5))				
writin		e this court p			
None					
Brief	statement of the issues to be raised on appeal				
The Patent determinati	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim on of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe	ther the	e Patrick/0	CBC disclosure is
The Patent determinati enabling, w must be ad whether Pe	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim ion of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether action violates Personal Audion any finding or determination	ther then s to revolves o's Sev	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent andment rights,
The Patent determinati enabling, w must be ad whether Pe	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim on of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether action violates Personal Audion any finding or determination	ther then s to revolves o's Sev	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent andment rights,
The Patent determinati enabling, w must be ad whether Pe issues, as v	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim ion of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe S. § 314, whether action violates Personal Audiany finding or determine any finding or determine s and opinions.	ether the ns to rev o's Sev ation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting o	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent andment rights,
The Patent determinati enabling, w must be ad whether Pe issues, as v	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim ion of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe S. § 314, whether action violates Personal Audiany finding or determine any finding or determine s and opinions.	ether then so to revo's Sev tation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting of	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent andment rights,
The Patent determination determination determination of the second determination of th	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim ion of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether actior violates Personal Audi any finding or determina and opinions.  ttlement of th	ether then so to revo's Sev tation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting of	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent indment rights, or related to those
The Patent determination determination determination of the second determination of th	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim on of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C patent Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision ersonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings there been discussions with other parties relating to set	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether actior violates Personal Audi any finding or determina and opinions.  ttlement of th	ether then so to revo's Sev tation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting of	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent indment rights, or related to those
The Patent determination determination determination of the second determination of th	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim ion of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ijudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings there been discussions with other parties relating to set s," when were the last such discussions?	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether actior violates Personal Audi any finding or determina and opinions.  ttlement of th	ether then so to revo's Sev tation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting of	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent indment rights, or related to those
The Patent determination determination determination of the second determination of th	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim on of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C indether the United Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision ersonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings there been discussions with other parties relating to set s," when were the last such discussions?  Before the case was filed below?	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether actior violates Personal Audi any finding or determina and opinions.  ttlement of th	ether then so to revo's Sev tation su	e Patrick/0 voke or ca enth Ame apporting of	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent indment rights, or related to those
The Patent determination and incomplete the property of the Patent determination and whether Perissues, as well as the property of the property of the Patent determination and the Patent det	Trial and Appeal Board's application and use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard, claim on of unpatentability of claims 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,112,504 B2 (the '504 Patent) under 35 U.S.C whether the United States Patent and Trademark Office exceeded its statutory authority under 35 U.S.C ljudicated in Article III Courts, whether the Inter Partes Review proceedings and Final Written Decision presonal Audio's constitutional rights were waived despite giving the PTO notice of the jury verdict, and a well as other issues decided adversely to patent owner Personal Audio in any orders, decisions, rulings there been discussions with other parties relating to set s," when were the last such discussions?  Before the case was filed below?  During the pendency of the case below?	C. §§ 102 and 103, whe C. § 314, whether actior violates Personal Audi any finding or determina and opinions.  ttlement of th	nis C	e Patrick/6 voke or ca enth Ame inporting of  case?	CBC disclosure is ancel a patent indment rights, or related to those

## FORM 26. Docketing Statement (continued)

Do you believe that this case may be a	menable to mediation?  Yes  No
If you answered no, explain why not _	
	change the effect of the PTO's Final Written , there is nothing that can be resolved outside of
Provide any other information relevan program.	t to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation
the United States Court of Appeals for	te copy of this Docketing Statement with the Clerk of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of the Circuit and served a copy of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of the Circuit and ser
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of, 2015
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of, 2015
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF (m	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of the Federal Circuit and
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF (m	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of the Federal Circuit and served a copy of t
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF (mr. PAPOOL S. CHAUHDARI  Name of Counsel  Law Firm Chaudhari Law, PLLC	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of 2015  nanner of service)  /S/ PAPOOL S. CHAUDHARI  Signature of Counsel
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF (m. PAPOOL S. CHAUHDARI  Name of Counsel	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of 2015  nanner of service)  /S/ PAPOOL S. CHAUDHARI  Signature of Counsel
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF  PAPOOL S. CHAUHDARI  Name of Counsel  Law Firm Chaudhari Law, PLLC  Address PO BOX 1863	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of 2015  nanner of service)  /S/ PAPOOL S. CHAUDHARI  Signature of Counsel
the United States Court of Appeals for record, this 9th day of November by: ECF  PAPOOL S. CHAUHDARI  Name of Counsel  Law Firm Chaudhari Law, PLLC  Address PO BOX 1863  City, State, ZIP Wylie, Texas 75098	r the Federal Circuit and served a copy on counsel of 2015  nanner of service)  /S/ PAPOOL S. CHAUDHARI  Signature of Counsel

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Appellant Personal Audio, LLC certifies that Appellee Electronic Frontier Foundation has been served the foregoing document this 9th day of November, 2015 electronically through the Court's ECF system.

/s/ Papooi S. Chauanari
Papool S. Chaudhari